

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are pending. Claims 1, 24 and 29 are independent claims.

FIG. 1 was amended to conform to the labels described in the specification as originally filed. No new matter was added.

Claims 6, 11, 21, 22 and 23 were amended to avoid vague and indefinite language and to provide proper antecedent basis for all terms. No new matter was added.

The examiner uses Hosea to reject claims 1-5, 7-8, 17, 18 and 24-28 as having been anticipated.

Claims 1 and 24 recite "inferring a profile from the scanned content," or similar language. Hosea neither describes nor suggests at least this quoted feature. On the contrary, Hosea infers a profile from the requesting user. Hosea's user profile is very different from applicant's scanned content profile. This is dramatically articulated by Hosea:

(t)he invention includes a method and system for personalizing displays of published Web pages provided by Web content providers to meet the interests of Web users accessing the pages, based on profiles of the users. (emphasis added) (see Abstract)

Accordingly, claims 1 and 24 are not anticipated by Hosea.

The examiner uses Hosea in combination with ordinary knowledge in the art to reject claims 6 and 19-21 as having been obvious.

Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Hosea in combination with ordinary skill in the art. Claims 6 and 19-21 depend upon, and further limit, claim 1. For example, claim 6, as amended, further defines that the inferred profile comprises a format of the scanned content and topical characteristics of the scanned content. Accordingly, claims 6 and 19-21 are not rendered obvious by Hosea in combination with ordinary skill in the art.

The examiner uses Hosea in combination with Massena to reject claims 9-11 and 13-16 as having been obvious.

Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Hosea and Massena. Claims 9-11 and 13-16 depend upon, and further limit, claim 1. Accordingly, claims 9-11 and 13-16 are not rendered obvious by Hosea and Massena.

The examiner uses Hosea and Muthuswamy to reject claim 12 as having been obvious.

Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Hosea and Muthuswamy. Claim 12 depends upon, and further limits, claim 1. Accordingly, claim 12 not rendered obvious by Hosea and Muthuswamy.

The examiner uses Hosea and Freedman to reject claims 22, 23 and 29 as having been obvious.

Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Hosea and Freedman. Claims 22 and 23 depend upon, and further limit, claim 1. Accordingly, claims 22 and 23 are not rendered obvious by Hosea and Freedman.

Claim 29 recites "generate a profile from the scanned content." Neither Hosea nor Freedman teach or suggest this quoted feature. Accordingly, claim 29 is not rendered obvious by Hosea and Freedman.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.


Enclosed is a \$430.00 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Applicant : Michael J. Witbrock, et al.
Serial No. : 09/803,540
Filed : March 9, 2001
Page : 10 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 10984-535001 / P257

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 29, 2004


Kenneth F. Kozik
Reg. No. 36,572

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

20923401.doc

Applicant : Michael J. Witbrock, et al.
Serial No. : 09/803,540
Filed : March 9, 2001
Page : 7 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 10984-535001 / P257

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 1 and replaces the original sheet including Fig. 1.

In Figure 1, was amended to conform to the labels described in the specification as originally filed..

Attachments following last page of this Amendment:

Replacement Sheet (1 page)
Annotated Sheet Showing Change(s) (1 page)